



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/710,760

11/10/2000

John C. Royer

5563.210-US

5635

25907

7590

10/22/2002

NOVOZYMES BIOTECH, INC.
1445 DREW AVE
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

LOEB, BRONWEN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1636

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2002

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/710,760

Applicant(s)

ROYER ET AL.

Examiner

Bronwen M. Loeb

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 90-102 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 90-96 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 97-102 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☒ Other: *See Continuation Sheet*.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Copy of Papers Originally Filed information.

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2 July 2002 has been entered.

Claims 90-102 are pending.

Response to Amendment

1. The rejection of claims 87-89 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, because the specification, with respect to scope of enablement has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment canceling the claims.

The rejection of claim 87-89 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment canceling the claims.

The rejection of claims 79, 81 and 83-89 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as lacking written description has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment canceling the claims.

The rejection of claims 85 and 89 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as lacking enablement has been withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendment canceling the claims. It is noted that Applicant's argument has been persuasive with respect to

Art Unit: 1636

Fusarium venenatum ATCC 20334. It is also noted that deposit information is provided on p. 61 for *E. coli* NRRL B-30029 containing plasmid pTri5.

2. New grounds of rejection are presented below. To the extent that the rejection below has been addressed in Applicant's amendment filed 2 July 2002, Applicant's arguments have been addressed.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 97-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This rejection is based on the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph "Written Description" Requirement published in the Federal Register (Volume 66, Number 4, Pages 1099-1111). Claim 97 is drawn to an isolated functional trichodiene synthase of SEQ ID NO. 2 wherein one or more amino acids are deleted from the amino and/or carboxyl terminus of SEQ ID No. 2. This is a genus claim in terms of any functional trichodiene synthase which has any amino- and/or carboxy-terminal deletions. Claim 101 is drawn

Art Unit: 1636

to an isolated trichodiene synthase obtained from a *Fusarium venenatum* strain comprising an amino acid sequence which differs by one, two, three, four or five amino acids from the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID No.2. This is a genus claim in terms of any isolated trichodiene synthase of SEQ ID No. 2 that has no more than five mutations. The specification mentions only the full length trichodiene synthase from *Fusarium venenatum*. This disclosure is not deemed to be descriptive of the complete structure of a representative number of species encompassed by the claims as one of skill in the art cannot envision all the fragments having trichodiene synthase activity based on the teachings in the specification. The specification does not teach regions or domains of the protein are essential for trichodiene synthase activity. There is no disclosure of what amino acids are in the active site, the binding pocket or the hydrophobic core of the protein. There is no structure/function relationship taught at all for SEQ ID No. 2. There is no teaching of how many amino acids may be deleted from either or both the N- and C-terminals and retain function. As discussed in MPEP 2163(I)(A), "a biomolecule sequence described only by a functional characteristic, without any known or disclosed correlation between that function and the structure of the sequence, normally is not a sufficient identifying characteristic for written description purposes, even when accompanied by a method of obtaining the claimed sequence". Therefore, the specification does not describe the claimed fragments in such full, clear, concise and exact terms so as to indicate that Applicant has possession of these fragments at the time of filing the present application. Thus, the written description requirement has not been satisfied.

Art Unit: 1636

In regard to a now-withdrawn written description rejection, Applicant argues that claims limited to the amino acid sequence of SEQ ID No. 2 would not adequately protect the inventors. This argument is not persuasive as this is not among the criteria to assess whether a specification meets written description for any genus claimed. Thus, Applicant's argument is not persuasive and the rejection has been applied to new claims 97-102.

Conclusion

Claims 90-96 are allowed. Claims 97-102 are rejected. Claims 90-102 are free of prior art.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Art Unit 1636 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The official fax telephone numbers for the Group are (703) 308-4242 and (703) 305-3014. NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bronwen M. Loeb whose telephone number is (703) 605-1197. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 10:00 AM to 6:30 PM. A phone message left at this number will be responded to as soon as possible (usually no later than the next business day after receipt by the examiner).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Remy Yucel, can be reached on (703) 305-1998.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Tracey Johnson, Patent Analyst whose telephone number is (703) 305-2982.

Customer service for Tech Center 1600 may be reached at (703)-308-0198.

Application/Control Number: 09/710,760
Art Unit: 1636

Page 6

Bronwen M. Loeb, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1636

October 20, 2002



**JAMES KETTER
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

09/710,760

The following papers have not been made part of the permanent records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) for this application (37 CFR 1.52(a)) because of damage from the United States Postal Service irradiation process:

Mailroom Stamp Date

Certificate of Mailing Date

5 Aug. 2002

30 July 2002 Paper #13

The above-identified papers, however, were not so damaged as to preclude the USPTO from making a legible copy of such papers. Therefore, the Office has made a copy of these papers, substituted them for the originals in the file, and stamped that copy:

**COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED**

If applicant wants to review the accuracy of the Office's copy of such papers, applicant may either inspect the application (37 CFR 1.14(d)) or may request a copy of the Office's records of such papers (*i.e.*, a copy of the copy made by the Office) from the Office of Public Records for the fee specified in 37 CFR 1.19(b)(4). Please do **not** call the Technology Center's Customer Service Center to inquiry about the completeness or accuracy of Office's copy of the above-identified papers, as the Technology Center's Customer Service Center will **not** be able to provide this service.

If applicant does not consider the Office's copy of such papers to be accurate, applicant must provide a copy of the above-identified papers (except for any U.S. or foreign patent documents submitted with the above-identified papers) with a statement that such copy is a complete and accurate copy of the originally submitted documents. If applicant provides such a copy of the above-identified papers and statement within **THREE MONTHS** of the mail date of this Office action, the Office will add the original mailroom date and use the copy provided by applicant as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers in place of the copy made by the Office. Otherwise, the Office's copy will be used as the permanent Office record of the above-identified papers (*i.e.*, the Office will use the copy of the above-identified papers made by the Office for examination and all other purposes). This three-month period is not extendable.

Part of Paper No. 14